

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>HAROLD WILSON,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 23-cv-2828-SMY</b>
	)	
<b>MADISON COUNTY, ILLINOIS and</b>	)	
<b>MADISON COUNTY SHERIFF'S</b>	)	
<b>OFFICE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>		

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' Motion for Entry of Order Extending Scheduling Order Deadlines (Doc. 57). Plaintiff opposes the motion (Doc. 58).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), "[a] schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The primary consideration for a district court in making a good-cause determination is the diligence of the party seeking amendment. *Trustmark Ins. Co. v. General & Cologne Life Re of Am.*, 424 F.3d 542, 553 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Notwithstanding Defendants' assertion, this case is not overly complicated. The Scheduling Order deadlines have been extended twice on the parties' joint request, and Defendants now seek a third extension without demonstrating good cause as to why they have been unable to complete discovery by now. Further, Defendants waited until after the current discovery deadline had expired before seeking an extension.

Accordingly, Defendants' Motion for Entry of Order Extending Scheduling Order Deadlines (Doc. 57) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: June 30, 2025**



---

**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**